UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,359	05/11/2001	John Melvin Brawn	10002247-1	1292

7590 05/04/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
FIELDS, COURTNEY D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/854,359	BRAWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Courtney D. Fields	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *31 January 2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statement respectfully submitted on 31 January 2005 has been considered by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 12-14, filed 31 January 2005, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-56 under 102 (b) in view of Shrader (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,666) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Reid et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,226).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reid et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,226).

Referring to the rejection of claims 1,17, and 34, Reid et al. discloses a secure network configured to carry data, comprising: a plurality of antibubbles (network devices) (See Column 2, lines 59-67, Column 3, lines 1-8), each antibubble having a

plurality of antibubble partitions (regions) (See Column 4, lines 49-53), each antibubble partition (region) having at least one network device configured to transmit and receive data (See Column 4, lines 54-67, Column 5, lines 1-13), and all of the network devices corresponding to at least one of the plurality of antibubbles (network devices) having the same network security policy and a plurality of network control points (firewalls)(See Column 5, lines 34-41), each network control point (firewall) including one or more network control point devices having at least one interface, wherein each of the plurality of antibubble partitions (regions) is connected to at least one network control point (firewall) to form a antibubble boundary (See Column 5, lines 41-57), the network control point (firewall) is used to provide a connection between any two network devices, and wherein at least one of the network control point devices is configured to enforce the network security policy of the antibubble that is connected to the network control point device (See Column 5, lines 58-67, Column 6, lines 1-8).

Referring to the rejection of claims 2,23, 33 and 35, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein a plurality of antibubble devices each have a interbubble device configured to connect at least two of the plurality of antibubbles to one another and to enforce the network security policy of each of the plurality of antibubbles that the interbubble device is connected in Column 4, lines 66-67, Column 5, lines 1-25.

Referring to the rejection of claims 3,24, 38 and 50, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each of the plurality of anitbubble partitions (regions) that belong to the same antibubble has the same network security policy applied at each of

the plurality of network control points that are connected to the plurality of antibubble partitions in Column 4, lines 66-67, Column 5, lines 1-5.

Referring to the rejection of claims 4,25, and 36, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each of the plurality of antibubble partitions (regions) has no network connectivity to all other antibubble partitions within the same antibubble in Column 3, lines 66-67, Column 4, lines 1-10.

Referring to the rejection of claims 5,27, 42 and 54, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each of the plurality of antibubble partitions is defined by an address range in Column 16, lines 50-57.

Referring to the rejection of claims 6,28, 43 and 55, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each of the network devices in each of the plurality of anitbubble partitions has an address contained within the address range in Column 17, lines 35-50.

Referring to the rejection of claims 7,29, 44 and 56, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein address exists in only one of the plurality of antibubble partitions in Column 5, lines 64-67, Column 6, lines 1-5.

Referring to the rejection of claims 8 and 46, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each of the plurality of network control points ensure source address integrity at each antibubble boundary in Column 6, lines 57-56.

Referring to the rejection of claims 9,26, and 47, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each of the plurality of antibubble partitions is connected to at least

two network control point devices to achieve high availability in the case of a failed interface or network control point device in Column 15, lines 11-25.

Referring to the rejection of claims 10,18, 30, 37,45, and 49, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein data not be transmitted between two network devices in different antibubble partitions of the same antibubble in Column 16, lines 50-67.

Referring to the rejection of claims 11,31, 39 and 52, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the plurality of network control points are coupled to one another and form a virtual backbone that is external to all of the plurality of antibubbles in Column 8, lines 43-57.

Referring to the rejection of claims 12,21, 32, 40, and 53, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the plurality of network control points ensure source address integrity across the virtual backbone in Column 6, lines 57-56, Column 8, lines 43-57.

Referring to the rejection of claims 13 and 41, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein each network device connects to only one network control point in Column 3, lines 9-18.

Referring to the rejection of claim 14, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein the total number of network control points is greater than the number of network control points connected to any one particular antibubble partition in Column 7, lines 8-32.

Referring to the rejection of claims 15,20, and 22, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein all data transmitted from one network device to another network device traverses only one network control point in Column 13, lines 39-50.

Referring to the rejection of claims 16 and 51, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein all data transmitted from one network device to another network device traverses only two network control points in Column 14, lines 14-30.

Referring to the rejection of claim 19, Reid et al. discloses the claimed limitation wherein a bubble having a distinct network security policy and a plurality of bubble partitions, each bubble partition having a plurality of network devices configured to transmit and receive data in Column 4, lines 66-67, Column 5, lines 1-7.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDF
cdf
April 15, 2005

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137